



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,070	08/20/2004	Ray A. Reyes	FIS920040145US1	5069

45094 7590 01/24/2006

HOFFMAN, WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO LLC
75 STATE ST
14TH FL
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER

TWEEL JR, JOHN ALEXANDER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2636

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Period for Reply

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 12-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,9 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-8 and 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2, 9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Beauvillier et al** [U.S. 6,104,291].

For claim 1, the apparatus for evaluating a RFID system taught by **Beauvillier** includes the following claimed subject matter, as noted, 1) the claimed text fixture is met by any of the embodiments shown having a base having a plurality of tag positions as seen in Figures 3D, 4D, and 8A for locating an RF tag relative to an RF antenna.

For claim 2, the embodiment seen in Figure 8A comprises a height adjustable mount configured to hold the tag at a selected vertical position relative to the antenna, wherein the mount can be positioned in different mount positions.

For claim 9, the reference includes an RF shield (No. 812) that has no effect on the RF antenna.

For claim 11, the reference determines operation distance of the RFID tag as a function of antenna gain and antenna transmitted power.

3. Claims 12-20 are allowed.
4. Claims 3-8 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Merely stating that a text fixture has a base for locating an RF tag relative to an RF antenna is not enough to merit patentability. The specific architecture of the text fixture and its relative test positions as recited in the dependent claims are unobvious in light of the prior art. Also, the method claims that link the RF tag to the existing operational RF antenna are also unobvious.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Perkins [U.S. 4,218,745] provides a fast, error-free method of electrical harness fabrication.

Mejia [U.S. 6,184,777] teaches a remotely testable transponder interrogation system.

Brady et al [U.S. 6,236,223] wirelessly tests RFID integrated circuits.

Berger et al [U.S. 6,259,353] interrogates an operational test transponder that is within a receiving range.

Friedman et al [U.S. 6,412,086] introduces a transponder including "on-chip" test circuitry.

Foltzer [U.S. 6,868,233] tests a fiber optic link formed of a single fiber.

Forster [U.S. 204/0160233] includes coupling elements for capacitively coupling a reader to an RFID device.

Lafferty [U.S. 2004/0227616] tests the validity of a transponder in a mobile communications system.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John A. Tweel, Jr. whose telephone number is 571 272 2969. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Hofsass can be reached on 571 272 2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2636

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAT
1/21/06

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John Tweel', with a stylized, cursive script.

JOHN TWEEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER